

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

PIN	4764	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	Northern California Joint Exercise of Powers	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$499,980
PROJECT TITLE	Sacramento Region Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$769,010

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Update and refine elements of the IRWMP: integrating water management planning with land use planning; refining integrated water management strategies for the region, developing an integrated monitoring and assessment program; and, facilitating public involvement, agency support, and adopting the plan by local agencies.

**WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

**Score:** 12

**Comment:** The work plan consists of identifying additional stakeholders, refining project screening criteria, establishing criteria to evaluate project effectiveness, and reporting criteria. The schedule seems reasonable, and plans for a December 2006 IRWMP adoption. However, with an expected "several hundred participating agencies" and potentially competing agencies within the region, this schedule will likely be difficult to attain.

**DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score:** 3

**Comment:** A detailed map of the Sacramento Valley water districts and an overview of the region were provided. However, the application did not specify, which agencies are included in or absent from the planning effort; some agencies appear to overlap and others are noticeably absent. The application makes reference to four other planning grant proposals for the portions of the region, but the applicant did not address those proposals, justify the segmentation, or describe how they will fit into this proposal. The proposal did not describe important ecological processes and economic conditions and trends within the region. Water quality in the region was generally characterized as good and problems were noted. However, the applicant did not identify impaired or listed water bodies.

**OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 8

**Comment:** The proposal has well defined objectives. Existing relationships between water related objectives, conflict in the region, and statewide priorities were well explained. Adaptive management plan developments are prevalent in the document. No clear discussion is provided as to how the objectives were determined, and the objectives listed in the work plan are different than those stated in the draft IRWMP contained in the application. The draft IRWMP included some statewide priorities.

**INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 6

**Comment:** The proposal identifies additional strategies that will be incorporated into the IRWMP and an evaluation criterion will be formulated to rank identified projects. Projects are to be assessed for multiple benefits, but it is unclear how they will be integrated. Many water management groups, agreements, activities, and existing management plans are presented. The applicant provided ideas for the incorporation of environmental enhancement, recreation, and public access strategies. More discussion could have been provided on how to integrate the various strategies.

**IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score:** 6

**Comment:** Implementation of the IRWMP will result from prioritizing the previous identified projects in the draft IRWMP as they relate to overall water management strategy for the region. Implementation is based on completion of short-term and long-term projects. A general schedule is provided; however, no specific mechanisms for implementation are included. The applicant will rely on the development of the IRWMP to define and formulate an implementation plan. The evaluation criterion was not found for monitoring the performance of the IRWMP or projects.

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

**IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 8**

**Comment:** Potential benefits of the IRWMP will be driven by the objectives stated in the draft IRWMP; however, all components of the draft will be revised, so no concrete objectives or potential effects are noted. Development of the IRWMP would help to move the RWMG toward integration of other CALFED water use efficiency practices beneficial to the Bay-Delta system. The IRWMP also has the potential to contribute water to the EWA and important ecological processes. The applicant indicates that an EIS/EIR is being prepared to allow for implementation of existing projects in the region and that additional NEPA/CEQA documents will be prepared for new facilities. Impacts and benefits will be evaluated on a project-by-project basis.

**DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** The applicant indicated that substantial data is available and expected to readily support preparation of the IRWMP. Additional studies are proposed in the work plan to better characterize the region and to further address surface water and groundwater quality and quantity issues. Refinement of the draft IRWMP will require the use of this data and additional data from the RWMG. The work plan includes identification of data needs, drawing heavily from other efforts within the region to create one central source for data. The applicant could have been more specific as to what data existed and how data gaps would be identified.

**DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 3**

**Comment:** The applicant states that the majority of the data used to develop the draft IRWMP is publicly available and that all new data will be made available to the public. The IRWMP will develop and recommend a process for data management and will rely heavily on existing knowledge for assistance. An effort to create a single regional database is ongoing. The proposal does not have a process for gathering and managing data from development and implementation of the IRWMP and disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public. The applicant could have suggested methods, such as publishing on the internet or hard-copy distribution for information dissemination. There were no indications that the proposed data management will support statewide data needs.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 3**

**Comment:** The proposal described stakeholders currently identified as partners or members of the SVWMA which consists of 70 water-related entities. During development of the IRWMP, a method of identifying additional stakeholders and a process for their participation will be developed. The public will have an opportunity to voice concern or support through open meetings. Although this need was identified in the work plan, more specifics could have been given. The applicant states that it will mirror the environmental justice compliance efforts undertaken by the SVWMP, but documentation was lacking.

**DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 3**

**Comment:** Eight counties are listed in the region and six are listed as DACs. The needs of the DACs will not be individually addressed, but dealt with in general by the IRWMP. DAC inclusion in the planning process will be at the County level through existing mechanisms (e.g., Board of Supervisor meetings). The proposal does not discuss specific impacts or direct benefits to the DACs. The applicant indicates the proposal will mutually benefit all communities within the region and plan development will be an open process that encourages participation from all groups.

**RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** The work plan indicates a 25-year planning horizon for the IRWMP and includes a review of "general plans of the cities and counties" is needed. Refinement of the draft IRWMP will include a review of the current and proposed land use planning processes of the local land use entities, such as counties and cities. The applicant did not indicate what those documents are or which cities or counties are included. Individual projects that meet the regional and state priorities and objectives will form the core of the IRWMP.

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

**AGENCY COORDINATION** - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

**Score:** 5

**Comment:** Agency coordination for the IRWMP is based on the existing framework established for the SVWMA and SVWMP with active involvement for identified stakeholders, local, State, and federal agencies. Local land-use planning decision-makers will be included. Letters of support from all eight counties Board of Supervisors are included in the proposal.

**TOTAL SCORE: 65**